DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 256 IR 003 231

AUTHOR Cater, Douglass
TITLE 1976: A Strategy for Political Broadcasting.
INSTITUTION Aspen Inst. for Humanistic Studies, Palo Alto, Calif. Program on Communications and Society.
PUB DATE 14 Mar 75
NOTE 14p.; Paper from the Political Broadcasting Conference (Washington, D.C., March 14, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Community Role; *Conference Reports; *Educational Television; Elections; Government Role; Political Influences; *Political Issues; *Politics; Programing (Broadcast); *Public Television; Social Action; Voting
IDENTIFIERS *Aspen Institute; Corporation for Public Broadcasting; Federal Communications Commission; Public Broadcasting Service

ABSTRACT

A conference of public broadcasters sponsored by the Aspen Institute discussed the role of noncommercial television in informing the public on political issues and covering political campaigns. The topics of discussion included: (1) governmental restrictions of public broadcasting, (2) governmental subsidies of political candidates, (3) broadcaster's commitment to full and impartial coverage of political events, (4) broadcaster's commitment to create a more enlightened electorate, (5) candidate's commitments to fair campaign tactics and honest advertising, and (6) the citizen's role as a monitor of the political process. A list of the conference participants is included. (EMH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121256

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

#713
$.50

ASPEN INSTITUTE

PROGRAM ON COMMUNICATIONS AND SOCIETY

360 Bryant Street, Palo Alto, California 94301

Douglass Cater, Director

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Aspen Institute

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

1976: A STRATEGY FOR POLITICAL BROADCASTING

The American Bicentennial Year is an occasion for demonstrating the strengths of our democracy. One urgent national objective must be to reverse the continuing decline in citizen participation in our electoral process. Broadcasting, which is now the dominant medium for transmitting news and information to our citizenry, has the capacity to further this crucial objective.

Those whose actions affect political broadcasting -- government (chiefly Congress and the FCC), the broadcasters, the candidates and their advisers, and various citizen organizations -- bring very different perspectives to this discussion. Some argue that both campaign coverage and political advertising on television have helped to illuminate issues and to create a more informed and sophisticated voting public. Others reply that effective campaign coverage is hamstrung by current law, that the present forms of political advertising are a disservice to the voting public, and that the current low level of voter participation may be attributed in part to the poor performance of television and radio.

Whatever disagreement there may be on specific issues, no one denies the enormous importance of broadcasting to American politics. Measured in campaign expenditures, purchase of broadcast time rose from $3 million in 1952 to $60 million in 1972.

One keen observer of the early years of television has concluded that his former views on political broadcasting are no longer valid. "We believed," he says, "that television increased interest in politics. We believed that the public was obtaining better understanding of issues. We believed that the public was acquiring increased knowledge of the political process. We thought that image-building could not be accomplished because of the x-ray power of the television camera. And we began to think that political commercials could sell candidates as effectively as commercials could sell cornflakes or underarm deodorants. These have all turned out to be myths."

If these are the myths of political broadcasting, what are the realities? More important, what <u>should</u> they be for the Bicentennial Year of 1976? What initiatives should government, broadcasters, candidates, and citizen groups now take if we are to achieve full and fair political broadcasting in 1976? How can political broadcasting enliven and enrich our political process as the nation enters its third century?

IR 003 231

On March 14, 1975, the Aspen Institute Program on Communications and Society held a planning conference at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. to consider proposals for improving political broadcasting in 1976. The thirty conferees reviewed a draft set of recommendations prepared for the Program by Sig Mickelson, former President of CBS News and Professor of Journalism at Northwestern University. The discussion revealed sometimes sharply conflicting views on the issues. On at least two general propositions, however, the Brookings conferees were in strong agreement:

First, they found a need for the continued exchange of ideas in order to set an agenda for political broadcasting. Conferees expressed surprise that there had been so little communication among the key groups before the Aspen conference.

Second, despite differences on some questions, the conferees expressed a strong desire for immediate initiatives to develop and implement a program of action. The conference was viewed not as a one-shot exchange of views but as the beginning of a long-term effort. The time for effective planning and implementation has already grown dangerously short.

Conference Proposals for Political Broadcasting in 1976

The following proposals, contained in the draft prepared by Sig Mickelson, were reviewed by conference participants:

A. Action by Government

1. Modify the equal-time provision of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act in order to make possible fuller campaign coverage by broadcasters at no cost to candidates.

2. Modify state and local regulations which now restrict campaign coverage by some public television stations.

3. Consider proposals for provision of free or low-cost time to candidates through government subsidy. In the latter category, consider a plan to require broadcast licensees (a) to make time available to candidates at 50 percent of the applicable rate-card price, and (b) to amend IRS regulations to permit licensees to claim the 50 percent savings for candidates as a normal business expense.

B. Action by Broadcasters

1. Promote a commitment by individual broadcasters and by the industry as a whole to provide fuller campaign coverage in both news and special programs in 1976 -- even if Section 315 is not modified.

2. Promote a commitment to make full use of new opportunities for extensive campaign coverage if one or more of the proposed government actions are taken.

3. Promote the development of a code of fair practices in political advertising among the National Association of Broadcasters, the Broadcast Code Review Board, and individual broadcasters. The

purpose of such a code would be to provide guidance -- not censorship -- for broadcasters in all dealings with candidates and their campaign advisers.

4. Promote the development of single programs and multi-broadcast campaigns designed to inform voters on the election process, to acquaint them with the issues, and to encourage them to vote.

C. Action by Candidates and Campaign Advisers

1. Cooperate fully with -- rather than attempt to circumvent -- the efforts of broadcasters to provide full and fair campaign coverage through interviews, debates, and other formats.

2. Provide leadership in terminating the abuses of political advertising (a) by assuming full responsibility for all advertising prepared on their behalf and, (b) by signing and adhering to pledges of fair practices that may be developed by voluntary citizen groups and by advertising trade associations.

3. Encourage the development and enforcement of codes of fair practices among advertising trade associations.

D. Action by Voluntary Citizen Organizations

1. Press for the adoption of government actions that will lead to fuller campaign coverage in 1976.

2. Establish programs to monitor the quality and quantity of campaign coverage by individual broadcasters and networks.

3. Establish programs to monitor the fairness of political advertising. Develop codes and pledges of fair practices in political advertising for adoption by candidates.

The Aspen Conference Discussions

Each of the draft proposals were considered:

A. Action by Government

1. Modify the equal-time provision of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act.

Broadcasters' efforts to eliminate the equal-time provision of Section 315 began nearly 20 years ago. Except for a one-time suspension in 1960 for the Kennedy-Nixon debates, no substantial progress has been achieved. Some conferees believe that a more moderate approach might receive a favorable response in Congress and the White House.

One specific modification has been suggested by Henry Geller, formerly General Counsel to the FCC and Special Assistant to Chairman Dean Burch. In addition to the existing exemptions for regularly scheduled news broadcasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and coverage of bona-fide news events, the Geller plan would also exempt "any other programs of a news or journalistic character:

(a) "which is regularly scheduled;

(b) "in which the content, format and participants are determined by the licensee or network;

(c) "which explores conflicting views on a current issue of public importance; and

(d) "which is not designed to serve the political advantage of any legally qualified candidate."

Geller argues that this amendment would eliminate or substantially diminish the risk of a station or network in scheduling debates and other formats for confrontations between candidates. The FCC supported such an additional exemption to Section 315 by a majority vote in June, 1972, but Congress has not acted on it.

One obstacle to candidate appearances during the course of a campaign might be the requirement that the program be "regularly scheduled." However, this problem might be resolved by the scheduling of a regular series of programs during the election period. For example, a program running consecutively for a period of eight, ten, or thirteen weeks during election periods should be viewed as"regularly scheduled."

The Geller plan, according to its advocates, would encourage stations to make time available for the kinds of programming most likely to promote public understanding of the political process. They note, however, that public pressure may have to be exerted to obtain full cooperation from broadcasters. They also note that any abuse of this coverage would still fall within the purview of the Fairness Doctrine.

Some conferees expressed support for the Geller plan. Others urged eliminating Section 315 with respect to the election of President and Vice President; they felt this approach had the greatest likelihood of approval by Congress. One conferee argued, however, that modification of Section 315 might work unfairly to the disadvantage of new or minor party candidates.

Several conferees suggested that quite apart from action by Congress, the FCC could facilitate better campaign coverage through revision or clarification of the Commission's policies relating to certain exemptions from the equal time law. (On April 22, 1975, a petition was submitted to the FCC by the Aspen Program in follow-up to this suggestion. See page 11 of this report.)

The argument was made by a broadcast representative that some broadcasters are quite content with the present status of Section 315 because it helps relieve them of the need to devote costly air time to campaigns. Undoubtedly, citizen group pressure will be necessary to encourage fuller coverage.

2. Modify state and local regulations restricting campaign coverage by public television.

Some public television stations operated by municipalities, states and educational institutions are restricted in coverage of political campaigns either by state or local law or by the policies of timid boards of trustees and executives. The conference agreed that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service, and agencies of local and state government should be urged to encourage full participation by all public broadcasting stations,and that state or local restrictions fall because of federal pre-emption.

A number of public stations -- those in Miami, Chicago and Dallas, for example -- have provided extensive and imaginative campaign coverage in the past. The conferees urged other public stations to match these standards. Public broadcasting, it was felt, has a special challenge to enrich the election process.

3. Consider proposals for provision of free or low-cost time to candidates through government subsidy.

Free and low-cost time proposals reflect in part the desire of candidates to obtain access to television within the restrictive financial framework of recent legislation for electoral reform. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, which placed a ceiling of six cents per voter on radio and television expenditures, appears to have cut television spending in the 1972 and 1974 elections by only a small degree. But the Campaign Reform Act of 1974, while eliminating the media spending ceilings, introduced overall spending limitations so restrictive that media spending levels -- particularly for Congressional candidates -- are likely to be reduced in many races. Whether campaigns for other offices in addition to the Presidency will be publicly financed in whole or in part in the future -- or continue to be privately financed -- candidates must come to terms with lower spending ceilings. This is an especially serious problem for non-incumbents.

Advocates of free or low-cost time ask whether it is the objective of public policy to reduce access to air time by candidates. If this is not our objective, they argue, then we should determine what measures -- free time, low-cost time, modification of Section 315, and others -- are required to ensure candidates full and fair access to air time.

One major proposal calls for program time sold to candidates (or their authorized supporters) to be billed at one half of the applicable time-card rate for the time period in question. The cost to broadcasters for such a rate reduction would be partially offset by allowing them to claim the reduction as a deductible business expense for income tax purposes. The reduction would not apply to spot announcements, which would continue to be billed at the lowest applicable unit rate.

How to allocate free air time is an especially sensitive issue. Herbert Alexander and others suggest a "differential equality of access," under which parties would be granted broadcast time on the basis of their relative strengths in previous elections or, for new parties, on the basis of evidence of substantial involvement in the electoral process. Plans with a feature of this kind have been developed in the United Kingdom, Germany, Canada, Australia and elsewhere.

Another proposal calls for direct government purchase of air time for use by candidates. Such plans have been developed in a number of countries, including Japan, Argentina and Mexico.

The Aspen conferees were divided on proposals for providing free or low-cost time to candidates through government subsidy. Some criticized proposals for allowing income tax deductions to offset rate-card reductions as inefficient and cumbersome. They argued that any government subsidy should go directly to candidates to enable them to make their own campaign spending decisions; the purchase of television time in certain markets, even at reduced rates, makes little sense. Others doubted that Congress is prepared to give serious consideration at present to free or low-cost time subsidy plans.

One conferee suggested that the key issue is access -- the opportunity for every significant candidate to have available the minimum amount of time necessary to make his views known. Once these terms of access are agreed upon, government should ensure that minimum access really exists. The FCC, it was argued, should urge broadcasters to make substantially more time available to candidates on their own initiative. The FCC should also analyze broadcasters' performances in providing access to candidates and consider this record during the license-renewal process. Other conferees opposed any initiative of this kind by the FCC.

B. Action by Broadcasters

1. Promote a commitment by individual broadcasters and by the industry to provide fuller and richer campaign coverage in both news and special programs, even if Section 315 is not modified.

With or without modification of Section 315, broadcasters have the capacity, if they choose to exercise it, to provide substantially fuller campaign coverage in 1976. Some licensees have worked hard in the past to bring extensive coverage not only to races involving two candidates but also to multi-candidate contests. In states where as many as five or seven candidates compete for gubernatorial or senatorial seats, some licensees have devoted many hours of valuable time, in varied formats, to presenting both major and minor party candidates. Other licensees, however, have chosen to sell time and spot advertisements and to claim Section 315 as an excuse for refraining from extensive campaign coverage even in two-candidate races.

Supporters of fuller campaign coverage argue that the NAB, the networks, and individual licensees themselves must face this issue squarely. They should examine carefully the extensive actions taken in past campaigns by some broadcasters -- including the commitment of time and resources and development of innovative formats -- to present candidates and to illuminate the political process. On the basis of such an analysis, they should then set standards for campaign coverage in 1976. One conferee argued that while political speeches may attract only 50 percent of the audience of the programs they displace, more innovative political programming can reach far larger audiences.

Some broadcasting conferees supported the spirit of this proposal, but pointed out that broadcasters must cope with tough nuts-and-bolts problems in attempting to broaden campaign coverage. One network has prepared a 79-page

manual on the issues confronted by its stations. Many stations have found candidates reluctant or even unwilling to appear for debates or interviews. /The Post-Newsweek Conference to be held in October will deal directly with these issues./

One conferee urged broadcasters to pay special attention to the needs of poor or inexperienced candidates who are unfamiliar with procedures for obtaining either free or purchased time. Broadcasters should ensure that all candidates are fully aware of the opportunities available to them.

2. Promote a commitment to make full use of the new opportunities for extensive campaign coverage if one or more proposed government actions are taken.

A modified Section 315 could greatly increase the opportunities for extensive campaign coverage by broadcasters. But the implementation will determine whether fuller campaign coverage in 1976 is actually achieved. Broadcasters will have the responsibility to open up additional time periods and offer more time for debates and interviews, as well as news and documentaries.

Government approval of free or low-cost time proposals would also require broadcasters to make special efforts. Such time should not be granted solely in marginal periods. With free time, in particular, broadcasters would have to ensure effective use of the time. Stations and networks should be expected to retain substantial production responsibility. Broadcasters should apply their creative talents to make such programs stimulating and attractive.

One conferee noted the recent evidence of the 1974 California gubernatorial election that broadcasters were being advised by consultants to downplay politics in order to boost ratings. If this trend continues, democracy will suffer in a society which gets most of its information via television.

3. Promote the development of a code of fair practices in political advertising.

High standards of performance must be demanded of those who authorize, produce and broadcast political advertising. The NAB, the BCRB, and individual broadcasters should all consider their professional responsibility in this field in the year 1976 -- two years after the end of Watergate and 200 years after the founding of the Republic.

One proposal calls for the development and enforcement of a code of fair practices in political advertising. Such a code would require accuracy and high standards and would forbid unfair attacks on opponents, smear tactics, deceptive arguments, distortions of fact, and extravagant claims. Some conferees expressed strong opposition to this proposal, arguing that censorship would be the result of any code of fair practices. Others strongly disagreed, pointing out that voluntary action is the best alternative to censorship.

4. Promote the development by broadcasters of campaigns designed to inform voters and encourage them to vote.

There was strong support for this proposal at the conference. One conferee suggested that broadcasters should view greater voter participation, which has fallen sharply in recent elections, as a major objective in 1976. Along with other Bicentennial programming, there should be an extensive schedule of spots and programming to encourage registration and voting. While some participants emphasized the need to address underlying factors accounting for low voter participation, there was general agreement that broadcasters have the opportunity -- if they choose to seize it -- to help achieve substantially increased voter participation in our Bicentennial Year.

C. Action by Candidates and Their Campaign Advisers

1. Cooperate fully with -- rather than circumvent -- efforts of broadcasters to provide full and fair campaign coverage.

Many candidates in past elections have deemed it advisable to decline one or another form of campaign coverage. This is not likely to change in 1976. Candidates, like broadcasters and citizen groups, must weigh their actions in 1976 by post-Watergate standards. They have a responsibility to help illuminate, rather than obfuscate, the political process. Even the most extensive efforts by broadcasters to provide fuller campaign coverage can be futile if candidates refuse to cooperate.

2. Provide leadership in terminating the abuses of political advertising.

A key broadcasting issue facing candidates is their use of political advertising and, in particular, of spot commercials. Some critics have urged a minimum length --five minutes, for instance -- for political commercials. Others believe spot commercials should be eliminated altogether.

Spot commercials accounted for 95 percent of total funds for political time purchases in 1970 and 88 percent in 1972. The list of those who strongly object to the use of political spot announcements is lengthy. Critics include Adlai Stevenson, Dean Burch, Nicholas Johnson, Paul Porter, Frank Reynolds of ABC, and such advertising executives as Edward Ney, John O'Toole and E. B. Weiss. According to Weiss, spot commercials "encourage shallow imagery, shoddy logic, and reprehensible mudslinging." Porter has written that spot commercials "employ insidious associations of images or ideas designed, like a malign post-hypnotic suggestion, to implant a lasting if irrational repugnance for the opposition. The damage to the democratic process is considerable . . ."

The value of spot commercials for candidates was the subject of considerable debate among the Aspen conferees. At least two studies suggest that issue-oriented commercials are more effective with the viewing public than image-oriented commercials. Other observers, however, find this distinction difficult to make. Even commercials that can be clearly classified as issue-oriented may still raise the objections noted by Porter and others.

Not all critics of political commercials are convinced that they should be eliminated completely. Some believe the commercials are a valuable, perhaps an essential tool for the relatively unknown candidate to achieve greater name identification and to equalize his standing with a better-known opponent. Others feel that unfair or inaccurate commercials provide their own punishment: candidates guilty of egregious distortions have almost invariably gone down to defeat. According to this view, the flood tide of offensive commercials in 1970 produced a wave of public resentment that led to a significant improvement in standards in 1972.

A survey of political commercials in 200 communities was conducted in 1972 by the Aspen Program on Communications and Society, the DuPont Awards of Columbia University, and members of the League of Women Voters. The survey found that while "image" was often stressed at the expense of "issues," and while the volume of commercials toward the end of the campaign was often overwhelming, widespread abuse was not in evidence. Nevertheless, this survey also concluded that there was some misuse of commercials, and there are no guarantees against a new flood of offensive commercials in future elections.

Some conferees suggest that candidates should be encouraged to sign not only the general pledge of fair campaign practices offered by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, but also an agreement directed specifically to political advertising. Among the organizations which might contribute to the development of such a pledge are the League of Women Voters, the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, the NAB and its Code Review Board, and the advertising trade associations.

Although the Aspen conferees expressed strong support for this general objective, some were skeptical that even the most elaborate codes of fair practices would deter candidates who are determined to use unfair political advertising. Others expressed doubt that codes of fair practices could be effectively implemented for the 1976 elections unless substantial resources -- both staff and financial -- are located immediately.

3. Encourage the development and enforcement of codes of fair practices among advertising trade associations.

There are, at present, a number of codes of fair practices applicable to product adverting. Some believe that the Association of National Advertisers, the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the American Advertising Federation, and the American Association of Political Consultants should develop a code which is narrowly applicable to political advertising.

It was suggested that the various trade associations representing political consultants, media advisers, and advertising agencies should follow up initial steps taken by the AAAA and the Council of Better Business Bureaus, through the National Advertising Review Board and the National Advertising division of CBBB, to set up a code of fair practices applicable to political broadcasting. The trade associations should also attempt to examine national political advertising and to cite violators of the code. The only sanction available to such agencies is that of publicity, but this sanction has often proved effective in the case of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and similar associations.

D. Action by Voluntary Citizen Organizations

1. Press for the adoption of government actions that will lead to fuller campaign coverage in 1976.

Although the conferees differed on the extent to which Section 315 should be modified, many expressed the view that a limited modification with respect to the election of President and Vice President is the one governmental action that might be taken in advance of the 1976 elections. They urged a concerted drive by voluntary citizen groups in support of such legislation. Others urged citizen-group support of the proposals on Section 315 directed to the FCC, such as in the petition filed by the Aspen Program (see page 11). The time is short for voluntary citizen groups to determine which measures they consider essential and what actions in support of those measures they can appropriately take.

2. Establish programs to monitor the quality and quantity of the campaign coverage by individual broadcasters and networks.

Voluntary citizen groups have developed considerable expertise in program monitoring, and this expertise could be well-utilized in 1976 for broadcast campaign coverage. Such monitoring, and public reporting of the results, could lead to significantly broader and better campaign coverage, with or without the modification of Section 315.

Several conferees urged that monitoring should have an affirmative rather than a negative orientation, identifying examples of excellent campaign coverage and supporting the production of such programs on an expanded scale. Others proposed development of a "voter sophistication" guide for political advertising similar to guides developed in past elections by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

3. Establish programs to monitor the fairness of political advertising.

The general survey of political commercials conducted in 1972 by members of the League of Women Voters represents only a modest example of what voluntary citizen groups can do to monitor political commercials in 1976. For the 1972 campaign, the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting developed a checklist of deceptive tactics and suggested criteria by which a voter might assess the accuracy and value of commercials.

The key questions for 1976 are (a) whether a reliable and workable checklist can be developed; (b) whether citizen groups, acting individually or jointly, can mount a monitoring campaign of sufficient scope to become a factor in both national and state and local races; and (c) whether some kind of candidate pledge of fair practices in political advertising can be prepared, offered to candidates for their adoption, and enforced.

Several conference participants observed that effective monitoring requires large numbers of people and substantial financial resources. Two steps are essential: first, a realistic plan for monitoring needs to be developed; and second, once a monitoring program has been agreed upon by participating citizen organizations, sufficient funds should be sought to carry out an effective program.

Actions Initiated Toward Responsible Political Broadcasting in 1976

Concrete efforts are already under way following the Aspen Program conference at the Brookings Institution. The Post-Newsweek Television Stations, in cooperation with the League of Women Voters and the Aspen Program, have begun planning for a conference for broadcasters in late October. Focus of this conference will be on problems and opportunities for political broadcasting in 1976.

Another project stimulated by the conference has been the petition to the FCC filed by the Aspen Institute Program on Communications and Society. The petition urges the FCC to act administratively to loosen Section 315 restraints on the coverage that broadcasters may give major party candidates; it suggests the revision of two policies, both specifically involving the 1959 amendment exempting certain programs from equal-time law. The first revision concerns exempting on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events from equal-time. The petition argues that narrow FCC rulings which have placed non-studio debates between major party candidates under equal-time provisions have misconstrued the law and its legislative history, thereby inhibiting full broadcast journalism and stifling robust debate.

The second revision would have the FCC adopt a rule or new policy statement assuring established interview programs (such as Meet the Press) that they would retain their exempt status even if moved to prime time and expanded to provide for back-to-back appearances of major candidates. Such FCC action is desirable to end present confusion and a substantial doubt that these modifications would remove a program from its exempt status. Neither revision would require Congressional action, yet each would enable broadcasters to inform the American public more effectively on important political races and issues. (The Aspen Program will provide copies of the petition on request.)

POLITICAL BROADCASTING CONFERENCE
Friday, March 14, 1975 12:00-3:30
Brookings Institution -- Room 105

Participants

ALEXANDER, Herbert
Citizens Research Foundation
245 Nassau Street
Princeton, New Jersey

ALLEN, James
The Washington Post Stations
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

CARPENTER, Elizabeth
Vice President
Hill and Knowlton, Inc.
1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

CHILDS, Prentiss
Public Affairs Coordinator
Programming Dept.
Public Broadcasting Service
485 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

CLEPHAS, Vincent
Democratic National Committee
2600 Virginia Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

COHEN, David
Common Cause
2030 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

COLE, Barry G.
1516 Mintwood Drive
McLean, Virginia 22101

GELLER, Henry
Rand Corporation
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

GRIFFIN, Nancy
Public Affairs Monitor
Public Broadcasting Service
485 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

GUGGENHEIM, Charles
Guggenheim Productions, Inc.
3121 South Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

GUTHRIE, Robert - Counsel
House Interstate & Foreign Commerce
Committee
2125 Rayburn
House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

JENCKS, Richard
Vice President
Columbia Broadcasting System
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

KEIM, Robert P.
President
The Advertising Council
825 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

LAMPL, Peggy
League of Women Voters
Washington, D.C.

LLOYD, Frank
Director
Citizens Communications Center
1914 Sunderland Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

LOOMIS, Henry
President
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
888 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

MAGUIRE, Charles
3411 Lowell Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

MICKELSON, Sig
Medill School of Journalism
Fisk Hall
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

MITCHELL, Lee
Sidley & Austin
1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

NEY, Edward N.
President
Young & Rubicam International, Inc.
285 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017

PACK, Dick
The Washington Post Stations
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

PARTON, James
National Advertising Review Board
Council of Better Business Bureaus, Inc.
845 Third Avenue
New York, New York

ROVE, Carl
Republican National Committee
310 First Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C.

ROYALL, Bill
Republican National Committee
310 First Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C.

SECREST, Lawrence
Administrative Assistant to the
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

SHRIVER, Liz
Assistant General Counsel
Public Broadcasting Service
485 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

SOMERS, John
National Association of Broadcasters
1771 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

STRAUS, Robert
Chairman
Democratic National Committee
2600 Virginia Avenue. N.W.
Washington, D.C.

ZAPPLE, Nicholas
Senate Commerce Committee
Old Senate Office Building #5202
Washington, D.C. 20510

Aspen Institute

CATER, Douglass
Aspen Institute Program on
Communications & Society
360 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, California 94301

FARBER, Stephen
993 Memorial Drive, Apt. 101
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138